

State-Based Reasoning and Temporal Logic

CS240B Notes



Notes based on Section 10.3 of *Advanced Database Systems*—Morgan Kaufmann, 1997

C. Zaniolo, April 2002

Discrete time, can be modelled using Datalog_{1s}.
The discrete temporal domain consists of terms built using the constant 0 and the unary function symbol +1 (written in postfix notation). For the sake of simplicity, we will write n for

$$\left(\dots \left(\overbrace{(0 + 1) + 1}^{n \text{ times}} \dots + 1 \right) \right)$$

if T is a variable in the temporal domain, then T , $T + 1$, and $T + n$ are valid temporal terms, where $T + n$ denotes

$$\left(\dots \left(\overbrace{(T + 1) + 1}^{n \text{ times}} \dots + 1 \right) \right)$$

Example: The endless succession of seasons

`quarter(0, winter).`

`quarter(T + 1, spring) ← quarter(T, winter).`

`quarter(T + 1, summer) ← quarter(T, spring).`

`quarter(T + 1, fall) ← quarter(T, summer).`

`quarter(T + 1, winter) ← quarter(T, fall).`

Example: Recurring Schedules

Trains for Newcastle leave daily at 800 hours and then every two hours until 2200 hours (military time)

before22(22).

before22(H) ←

before22(H + 1).

leaves(8, newcastle).

leaves(T + 2, newcastle) ←

leaves(T, newcastle),

before22(T + 2).

Propositional Linear Temporal Logic(PLTL)

PLTL is based on the notion that there is a succession of states $H = (S_0, S_1, \dots)$, called a *history*.

For instance, Trains to Newcastle can be modelled by a predicate *newcstl* that holds true in the following states: $S_8, S_{10}, S_{12}, S_{14}, S_{16}, S_{18}, S_{20}, S_{22}$, and it is false everywhere else.

Modal operators are used to define in which states a predicate p holds true.

Propositional Linear Temporal Logic (PLTL).

1. *Atoms:* Let p be an atomic propositional predicate. Then p is said to hold in history H when p holds in H 's initial state S_0 .

For instance, $\neg newcastl$ is true in our example since it is true in S_0

Temporal Operators

In addition to the usual propositional operators \vee , \wedge , and \neg , PLTL offers the following operators:

2. *Next*: Next p , denoted $\bigcirc p$, is true in history H , when p holds in history $H_1 = (S_1, S_2, \dots)$.
Therefore, $\bigcirc^n p$, $n \geq 0$, denotes that p is true in history (S_n, S_{n+1}, \dots) .
For instance,

$$\bigcirc^8 \text{newcastl} \wedge \bigcirc^9 \neg \text{newcastl}$$

is true since there is a train at 8 and no train at 9.

Other Temporal Operators

3. *Eventually*: Eventually q , denoted $\mathcal{F}q$, holds when, for some n , $\bigcirc^n q$.
4. *Until*: p until q , denoted $p \mathcal{U} q$, holds if, for some n , $\bigcirc^n q$, and for every state $k < n$, $\bigcirc^k p$.

Other Operators

- For instance, the fact that q will never be true can simply be defined as $\neg\mathcal{F}q$.
- The fact that q is always true is simply described as $\neg\mathcal{F}(\neg q)$; the notation $\mathcal{G}q$ is often used to denote that q is always true.
- The operator p before q , denoted $p\mathcal{B}q$ can be defined as $\neg((\neg p) \mathcal{U} q)$ —that is, it is not true that p is false until q .

PLTL finds many applications, including temporal queries and proving properties of dynamic systems.

For instance, the question “Is there a train to Newcastle that is followed by another one hour later?” can be expressed by the following query:

$$?\mathcal{F}(\text{newcst1} \wedge \bigcirc \text{newcst1})$$

Temporal Reasoning with Datalog_{1S}

Every query expressed in PLTL can also be expressed in propositional Datalog_{1S} (i.e., Datalog with only the temporal argument).

For instance, the previous query can be expressed by query `?pair_to_newcst1`, where:

$$\text{pair_to_newcst1} \leftarrow \text{newcst1}(J) \wedge \text{newcst1}(J + 1).$$

Temporal Reasoning with Datalog_{1S}

Express $p \mathcal{U} q$: p must be true at each instant in history, until the first state in which q is true. Use recursion to reason back in time and identify all states in history that precede the first occurrence of q .

$$\text{post_q}(J + 1) \leftarrow q(J).$$

$$\text{post_q}(J + 1) \leftarrow \text{post_q}(J).$$

$$\text{first_q}(J) \leftarrow q(J), \neg \text{post_q}(J).$$

$$\text{pre_first_q}(J) \leftarrow \text{first_q}(J + 1).$$

$$\text{pre_first_q}(J) \leftarrow \text{pre_first_q}(J + 1).$$

$$\text{fail_p_Until_q} \leftarrow \text{pre_first_q}(J), \neg p(J).$$

$$p_Until_q \leftarrow \text{pre_q}(0), \neg \text{fail_p_Until_q}.$$

A similar approach can be used to express other operators of temporal logic. For instance, $p \mathcal{B} q$ can be defined using the previous predicates and the rule

$$p_Before_q \leftarrow p(J), pre_first_q(J).$$